Instructions for Using the Plan Review Crosswalk for Review of Local Mitigation Plans

Attached is a Plan Review Crosswalk based on the *Multi-Hazard Mitigation Planning Guidance Under the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000*, published by FEMA, dated March 2004. This Plan Review Crosswalk is consistent with the *Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000* (P.L. 106-390), enacted October 30, 2000 and 44 CFR Part 201 – Mitigation Planning, Interim Final Rule (the Rule), published February 26, 2002.

SCORING SYSTEM

- N Needs Improvement: The plan does not meet the minimum for the requirement. Reviewer's comments must be provided.
- S Satisfactory: The plan meets the minimum for the requirement. Reviewer's comments are encouraged, but not required.

Each requirement includes separate elements. All elements of a requirement must be rated "Satisfactory" in order for the requirement to be fulfilled and receive a summary score of "Satisfactory." A "Needs Improvement" score on elements shaded in gray (recommended but not required) will not preclude the plan from passing.

When reviewing single jurisdiction plans, reviewers may want to put an N/A in the boxes for multi-jurisdictional plan requirements. When reviewing multi-jurisdictional plans, reviewers may want to put an N/A in the prerequisite box for single jurisdiction plans.

States that have additional requirements can add them in the appropriate sections of the *Multi-Hazard Mitigation Planning Guidance* or create a new section and modify this Plan Review Crosswalk to record the score for those requirements.

Optional matrices for assisting in the review of sections on profiling hazards, assessing vulnerability, and identifying and analyzing mitigation actions are found at the end of the Plan Review Crosswalk.

The example below illustrates how to fill in the Plan Review Crosswalk.

Example

Assessing Vulnerability: Overview

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii): [The risk assessment **shall** include a] description of the jurisdiction's vulnerability to the hazards described in paragraph (c)(2)(i) of this section. This description **shall** include an overall summary of each hazard and its impact on the community.

	Location in the Plan (section or		SCO	ORE
Element	annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	N	S
A. Does the plan include an overall summary description of the jurisdiction's vulnerability to each hazard?	Section II, pp. 4-10	The plan describes the types of assets that are located within geographically defined hazard areas as well as those that would be affected by winter storms.		✓
Does the plan address the impact of each hazard on the jurisdiction?	Section II, pp. 10- 20	The plan does not address the impact of two of the five hazards addressed in the plan. Required Revisions: Include a description of the impact of floods and earthquakes on the assets. Recommended Revisions: This information can be presented in terms of dollar value or percentages of damage.	1	
	-	SUMMARY SCORE	✓	

Local Mitigation Plan Review and Approval Status

Jurisdiction:	Title of Plan:		Date of Plan:	
Mineral County, MT	PDM Plan		17 February 2005	
Local Point of Contact:		Address:		
George Gupton		PO Box 870		
Title:		110 Second Ave., East		
Emergency Manager		Superior, MT 59872		
Agency:				
Mineral County, MT				
Phone Number:		E-Mail:		
406/822-4388				

State Reviewer:	Title:	Date:
Larry B. Akers	MT SHMO	22 March 2005

FEMA Reviewer: KC Collins Dave Kyner Ken Crawford	Title: Mitigation Specialist Mitigation Specialist Mitigation Specialist	Date: April/May 2005
Date Received in FEMA Region VIII		1
Plan Not Approved		
Plan Approved	xxxxx	
Date Approved	June 8, 2005	

	NFIP Status*			
Jurisdiction:	Υ	N	N/A	CRS Class
1. Mineral County Map 11/1/96 (L) Good Standing	X			
2. Town of Superior Map 1/5/01 Good Standing	X			
3. Town of Alberton Never Mapped			X	

^{*} Notes: Y = Participating

N = Not Participating

s

PLAN APPROVED

LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW SUMMARY

The plan cannot be approved if the plan has not been formally adopted.

Each requirement includes separate elements. All elements of the requirement must be rated "Satisfactory" in order for the requirement to be fulfilled and receive a score of "Satisfactory." Elements of each requirement are listed on the following pages of the Plan Review Crosswalk. A "Needs Improvement" score on elements shaded in gray (recommended but not required) will not preclude the plan from passing. Reviewer's comments must be provided for requirements receiving a "Needs Improvement" score.

SCORING SYSTEM

Please check one of the following for each requirement.

- N Needs Improvement: The plan does not meet the minimum for the requirement. Reviewer's comments must be provided.
- **S Satisfactory:** The plan meets the minimum for the requirement. Reviewer's comments are encouraged, but not required.

Prerequisite(s) (Check Applicable Box)	NOT MET	MET
Adoption by the Local Governing Body: §201.6(c)(5) OR		Х
Multi-Jurisdictional Plan Adoption: §201.6(c)(5) AND		х
Multi-Jurisdictional Planning Participation: §201.6(a)(3)		Х
Planning Process	N	s
Documentation of the Planning Process: §201.6(b) and §201.6(c)(1)		Х
Risk Assessment	N	s
Identifying Hazards: §201.6(c)(2)(i)		Х
Profiling Hazards: §201.6(c)(2)(i)		Х
Assessing Vulnerability: Overview: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)		Х
Assessing Vulnerability: Identifying Structures: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(A)	х	
Assessing Vulnerability: Estimating Potential Losses: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(B)		Х
Assessing Vulnerability: Analyzing Development Trends: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(C)	Х	
Multi-Jurisdictional Risk Assessment: §201.6(c)(2)(iii)		X

<u> </u>		
Local Hazard Mitigation Goals: §201.6(c)(3)(i)) X	
Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Action §201.6(c)(3)(ii)	ns: X	
Implementation of Mitigation Actions: §201.6(c)(3)(iii)	х	
Multi-Jurisdictional Mitigation Actions: §201.6(c)(3)(iv)	х	
Plan Maintenance Process	N S	
Monitoring, Evaluating, and Updating the Plar §201.6(c)(4)(i)	n: X	
Incorporation into Existing Planning Mechanis §201.6(c)(4)(ii)	sms: X	
Continued Public Involvement: §201.6(c)(4)(iii	i) X	
LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN APPROVA	L STATUS]
	Г	
	PLAN NOT APPROVED	

Mitigation Strategy

XXXXX

PREREQUISITE(S)

Adoption by the Local Governing Body

Requirement §201.6(c)(5): [The local hazard mitigation plan **shall** include] documentation that the plan has been formally adopted by the governing body of the jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan (e.g., City Council, County Commissioner, Tribal Council).

	Location in the		SCC	ORE
	Plan (section or		NOT	
Element	annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	MET	MET
A. Has the local governing body adopted the plan?	Page iv	Yes the plan has been adopted on 12/15/2004.		S
B. Is supporting documentation, such as a resolution, included?	Page iv	Yes, Resolution # 12-15-04B is provided and is signed and dated.		S
		SUMMARY SCORE		S

Multi-Jurisdictional Plan Adoption

Requirement §201.6(c)(5): For multi-jurisdictional plans, each jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan **must** document that it has been formally adopted.

	Location in the		SCC	ORE
	Plan (section or		NOT	
Element	annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	MET	MET
A. Does the plan indicate the specific jurisdictions represented in the plan?	Page 1-1	Yes, the towns of Superior and Alberton along with Mineral County are seeking plan approval.		S
B. For each jurisdiction, has the local governing body adopted the plan?	Page v	Yes the plan was adopted by Superior on 01/10/2005, and by Alberton on 12/22/2004.		S
C. Is supporting documentation, such as a resolution, included for each participating jurisdiction?	Page vi	Yes, see Superior Resolution # 276, and Alberton Resolution (no # provided).		S
		SUMMARY SCORE		S

Multi-Jurisdictional Planning Participation

Requirement §201.6(a)(3): Multi-jurisdictional plans (e.g., watershed plans) may be accepted, as appropriate, as long as each jurisdiction has participated in the process ... Statewide plans will not be accepted as multi-jurisdictional plans.

	Location in the		SCC	ORE
	Plan (section or		NOT	
Element	annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	MET	MET
 Does the plan describe how each jurisdiction participated in the plan's development? 	Pages 2-1 and 2-2; Appendix A	Yes, three stakeholder meetings were held in July, August and November 2003. Stakeholders were LEPC members, and others working in disaster mitigation, emergency management, local government administration, healthcare, transportation and utilities.		S
		SUMMARY SCORE		S

PLANNING PROCESS: §201.6(b): An open public involvement process is essential to the development of an effective plan.

Documentation of the Planning Process

Requirement §201.6(b): In order to develop a more comprehensive approach to reducing the effects of natural disasters, the planning process **shall** include: (1) An opportunity for the public to comment on the plan during the drafting stage and prior to plan approval;

- (2) An opportunity for neighboring communities, local and regional agencies involved in hazard mitigation activities, and agencies that have the authority to regulate development, as well as businesses, academia and other private and non-profit interests to be involved in the planning process; and
- (3) Review and incorporation, if appropriate, of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information.

Requirement §201.6(c)(1): [The plan **shall** document] the planning process used to develop the plan, including how it was prepared, who was involved in the process, and how the public was involved.

•	Location in the		SCC	RE
Element	Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	N	S
Does the plan provide a narrative description of the process followed to prepare the plan?	Pages 2-1 to 2-3	Yes, the Emergency Management Agency Director oversaw the creation of the plan as alluded to on page 2-3. Stakeholder interviews were conducted and six public meetings were held.		Ø
B. Does the plan indicate who was involved in the planning process? (For example, who led the development at the staff level and were there any external contributors such as contractors? Who participated on the plan committee, provided information, reviewed drafts, etc.?)	Appendix A and Appendix C	Yes, the names of those involved in the planning process are listed and provided in Appendix A. Meeting minutes provided in Appendix C indicate how meetings were conducted.		Ø
C. Does the plan indicate how the public was involved? (Was the public provided an opportunity to comment on the plan during the drafting stage and prior to the plan approval?)	Pages 2-1 to 2-3; Appendixes A, B and C	Yes, four public meetings were held to give the public an opportunity to comment on the plan. Appendix B contains copies of public notices sent out.		Ø
D. Was there an opportunity for neighboring communities, agencies, businesses, academia, nonprofits, and other interested parties to be involved in the planning process?	Appendix B	Yes, through the public meetings notices included under Appendix B. The plan does a good job of documenting the planning and public process for this plan. Representation from both Alberton and Superior are shown.		S
Does the planning process describe the review and incorporation, if appropriate, of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information?	Page 2-1 and Page 4-1	Yes existing plans/studies/reports were referenced during the hazard evaluation and risk assessment process as indicated on page 2-1 – at the first Stakeholder Group meeting one of the purposes was to identify plans and documents that demonstrate ongoing disaster mitigation work and identify resources documenting hazard occurrence. Table 4-1 on page 4-1 indicates the resources referenced for each hazard assessed in the plan.		S
		SUMMARY SCORE		S

RISK ASSESSMENT: $\S 201.6(c)(2)$: The plan shall include a risk assessment that provides the factual basis for activities proposed in the strategy to reduce losses from identified hazards. Local risk assessments must provide sufficient information to enable the jurisdiction to identify and prioritize appropriate mitigation actions to reduce losses from identified hazards.

Identifying Hazards

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i): [The risk assessment shall include a] description of the type ... of all natural hazards that can affect the jurisdiction.

	Location in the		SCO	ORE
Element	Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	N	S
A. Does the plan include a description of the types of all natural hazards that affect the jurisdiction? If the hazard identification omits (without explanation) any hazards commonly recognized as threats to the jurisdiction, this part of the plan cannot receive a Satisfactory score.	Page 2-2	Page 2-2 Table 2-1 provides a list of natural and human made disasters for Mineral County. Other hazards not retained for evaluation were either being evaluated in other processes or risks were so low that additional evaluation was not necessary.		S
		SUMMARY SCORE		S

Profiling Hazards

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i): [The risk assessment **shall** include a] description of the ... location and extent of all natural hazards that can affect the jurisdiction. The plan **shall** include information on previous occurrences of hazard events and on the probability of future hazard events.

	Location in the		SCO	ORE
Element	Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	N	S
A. Does the risk assessment identify the location (i.e., geographic area affected) of each natural hazard addressed in the plan?	Chapter 4.0	Location and extent is discussed in the hazard analysis of Chapter 4.0 for all hazard events assessed. Other references available include: www.sheldus.org data indicates that winter storms caused the most property damage between 1960 and 2003, next was severe storms and ranked third was floods. One bridge with critical scour potential in Mineral County and is located along I-90, according to HAZUS data available. Including this information would enhance the plan.		S
B. Does the risk assessment identify the extent (i.e., magnitude or severity) of each hazard addressed in the plan?	Chapter 4.0	Yes the extent of hazards is provided in discussions of location and extent provided in Chapter 3.0 for each hazard type assessed - mapping of locations and discussions of previous events cover extent and location of hazards in the county.		S
C. Does the plan provide information on previous occurrences of each hazard addressed in the plan?	Pages 4-1 to 4- 28	Yes, Previous Occurrences are listed in the plan.		S
D. Does the plan include the probability of future events (i.e., chance of occurrence) for each hazard addressed in the plan?	Page 5-1	Yes the probability of hazards to occur in the future is provided in Table 5-1 that took into account probability (possibility to occur in a given year looking at past frequencies).		S
		SUMMARY SCORE		S

Assessing Vulnerability: Overview

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii): [The risk assessment shall include a] description of the jurisdiction's vulnerability to the hazards described in paragraph

(c)(2)(i) of this section. This description **shall** include an overall summary of each hazard and its impact on the community.

	Location in the		SCO	ORE
Element	Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	N	S
A. Does the plan include an overall summary description of the jurisdiction's vulnerability to each hazard?	Page 5-1	The vulnerability is addressed in the table on Page 5-1 in terms of overall risk that took into account frequency, potential impact to property (community) and potential casualties.		S
B. Does the plan address the impact of each hazard on the jurisdiction?	Page 5-1	Yes, impact is covered in Table 5-1 and is based on both property and population impacts.		S
		SUMMARY SCORE		S

Assessing Vulnerability: Identifying Structures

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(A): The plan **should** describe vulnerability in terms of the types and numbers of existing and future buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard area \dots .

	Location in the		SCO	ORE
Element	Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	N	S
A. Does the plan describe vulnerability in terms of the types and numbers of existing buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard areas?	Pages 3-1 to 3-6	Critical facilities by jurisdiction are highlighted in the plan, but not by hazard area. To enhance the plan, hazard prone areas should be mapped for each community and then calculate the worth of buildings and infrastructure within each hazard zone. Note: A "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.	N	
B. Does the plan describe vulnerability in terms of the types and numbers of future buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard areas?	Chapter 3.0	Types and numbers of future buildings and infrastructure is not included in the plan. In order to receive a satisfactory rating for this requirement, anticipated types and numbers of future buildings and infrastructure in hazard prone areas needs to be estimated and discussed in the plan. Note: A "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.	N	
		SUMMARY SCORE	N	

Assessing Vulnerability: Estimating Potential Losses

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(B): [The plan **should** describe vulnerability in terms of an] estimate of the potential dollar losses to vulnerable structures identified in paragraph (c)(2)(i)(A) of this section and a description of the methodology used to prepare the estimate

	Location in the		SCC	DRE
Element	Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	N	S
A. Does the plan estimate potential dollar losses to vulnerable structures?	Page 4-28	A summary of potential dollar losses associated with each hazard type was included in the plan on Page 4-28 in Table 4-14. The plan did a great job of using HAZUS models to predict losses. Note: A "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.		S
B. Does the plan describe the methodology used to prepare the estimate?	Pages 4-1 to 4-28	Yes potential losses by hazard type were calculated and the methodology was explained in Chapter 4.0 under probability of occurrence/loss estimate sections. Note: A "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.		S
·		SUMMARY SCORE		S

Assessing Vulnerability: Analyzing Development Trends

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(C): [The plan **should** describe vulnerability in terms of] providing a general description of land uses and development trends within the community so that mitigation options can be considered in future land use decisions.

	Location in the		SCO	ORE
Element	Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	N	S
Does the plan describe land uses and development trends?		This plan did not provide a discussion of land use and development trends. Note: A "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.	N	
		SUMMARY SCORE	N	

Multi-Jurisdictional Risk Assessment

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(iii): For multi-jurisdictional plans, the risk assessment **must** assess each jurisdiction's risks where they vary from the risks facing the entire planning area.

	Location in the		SCC)RE
Element	Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	N	S
A. Does the plan include a risk assessment for each participating jurisdiction as needed to reflect unique or varied risks?	Pages 5-2 to 5-3	Projects identified are <u>countywide</u> and do not highlight specifically Alberton or Superior. Specific projects for each jurisdiction would strengthen the plan in future revisions.		S
		SUMMARY SCORE		S

MITIGATION STRATEGY: $\S 201.6(c)(3)$: The plan shall include a mitigation strategy that provides the jurisdiction's blueprint for reducing the potential losses identified in the risk assessment, based on existing authorities, policies, programs and resources, and its ability to expand on and improve these existing tools.

Local Hazard Mitigation Goals

Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(i): [The hazard mitigation strategy **shall** include a] description of mitigation goals to reduce or avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards.

	Location in the		SCO	DRE
Element	Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	N	S
A Does the plan include a description of mitigation goals to reduce or avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards? (GOALS are long-term; represent what the community wants to achieve, such as "eliminate flood damage"; and are based on the risk assessment findings.)	Pages 5-2 to 5-3	Yes, five goals for mitigation efforts are listed on Pages 5-2 and 5-3 in the plan		\$
		SUMMARY SCORE		S

Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Actions

Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(ii): [The mitigation strategy **shall** include a] section that identifies and analyzes a comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions and projects being considered to reduce the effects of each hazard, with particular emphasis on new and existing buildings and infrastructure.

	Location in the		SCO	ORE
Element	Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	N	S
A. Does the plan identify and analyze a comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions and projects for each hazard?	Pages 5-2 to 5-3	Yes, numerous mitigation actions are identified in the plan.		S
B Do the identified actions and projects address reducing the effects of hazards on new buildings and infrastructure?	Pages 5-2 to 5-3	Yes, new buildings and infrastructure are addressed in the mitigation actions. For example, providing generators and ongoing mapping of residences would include protection for new structures.		S
C. Do the identified actions and projects address reducing the effects of hazards on existing buildings and infrastructure?	Pages 5-2 to 5-3	Yes, existing buildings and infrastructure are addressed in the mitigation actions. For example, providing generators and mapping of residences would protect existing structures.		S
		SUMMARY SCORE		S

Implementation of Mitigation Actions

Requirement: $\S 201.6(c)(3)(iii)$: [The mitigation strategy section shall include] an action plan describing how the actions identified in section (c)(3)(ii) will be prioritized, implemented, and administered by the local jurisdiction. Prioritization shall include a special emphasis on the extent to which benefits are maximized according to a cost benefit review of the proposed projects and their associated costs.

	Location in the		SCO	ORE
Element	Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	N	S
A. Does the mitigation strategy include how the actions are prioritized ? (For example, is there a discussion of the process and criteria used?)	Pages 5-4 to 5-5	These pages identify criteria for prioritizing goals, which included Costs, Reduced Casualties and Reduced Structural Damage.		S
B. Does the mitigation strategy address how the actions will be implemented and administered ? (For example, does it identify the responsible department, existing and potential resources, and timeframe?)	Pages 6-1 and 6-2	This requirement is marginally met. Administration of mitigation actions is defined in the plan. The jurisdiction, lead agency, and funding for each of the three top priority projects is provided. However, the timeframe is not provided for each project identified. Future submittals must include timeframes for mitigation projects identified.		S
C. Does the prioritization process include an emphasis on the use of a cost-benefit review (see page 3-36 of <i>Multi-Hazard Mitigation Planning Guidance</i>) to maximize benefits?	Page 5-4	The criteria for prioritization are cost/benefit oriented as indicated above in Section A.		S
		SUMMARY SCORE		S

Multi-Jurisdictional Mitigation Actions

Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(iv): For multi-jurisdictional plans, there **must** be identifiable action items specific to the jurisdiction requesting FEMA approval or credit of the plan.

	Location in the		SCO	ORE
Element	Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	N	S
A Does the plan include at least one identifiable action item for each jurisdiction requesting FEMA approval of the plan?	Pages 5-2 and 5-3	All mitigation <u>projects are county wide</u> and not specific to Alberton or Superior. Specific projects for each jurisdiction would strengthen the plan in future revisions.		S
		SUMMARY SCORE		S

PLAN MAINTENANCE PROCESS

Monitoring, Evaluating, and Updating the Plan

Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(i): [The plan maintenance process **shall** include a] section describing the method and schedule of monitoring, evaluating, and updating the mitigation plan within a five-year cycle.

	Location in the		SCC	DRE
Element	Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	N	S
A. Does the plan describe the method and schedule for monitoring the plan? (For example, does it identify the party responsible for monitoring and include a schedule for reports, site visits, phone calls, and meetings?)	Page 6-1	Yes, the County LEPC will be responsible for monitoring, reviewing and updating the plan every year and meet about the plan at their Annual LEPC meeting held in January. The LEPC will make changes and submit them to the MDES. An updated plan will be reviewed by Alberton and Superior every 5 years. The next plan to MDES is scheduled to occur in 2009.		S
B. Does the plan describe the method and schedule for evaluating the plan? (For example, does it identify the party responsible for evaluating the plan and include the criteria used to evaluate the plan?)	Page 6-1	The LEPC will evaluate the plan at their annual January meetings.		S
C. Does the plan describe the method and schedule for updating the plan within the five-year cycle?	Page 6-1	Updates will be completed as needed after a review during the January LEPC meetings. Updates will then be submitted to MDES.		S
		SUMMARY SCORE		S

Incorporation into Existing Planning Mechanisms

Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(ii): [The plan **shall** include a] process by which local governments incorporate the requirements of the mitigation plan into other planning mechanisms such as comprehensive or capital improvement plans, when appropriate.

	Location in the		SCC	DRE
Element	Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	N	S
A. Does the plan identify other local planning mechanisms available for incorporating the requirements of the mitigation plan?	Page 6-1	Yes, the plan states that any current or future planning will incorporate these goals, objectives into growth plans, subdivision regulations, floodplain regulations, and other land use tools that can help reduce exposure to losses from natural hazards.		S
B. Does the plan include a process by which the local government will incorporate the requirements in other plans, when appropriate?	Page 6-1	This requirement is marginally met. From Section A above it could be assumed that local government will do the same as the county, by way of incorporating goals and projects identified in this plan into their other planning mechanisms; however, it is not specifically stated that the local jurisdictions will do so.		S
		SUMMARY SCORE		S

Continued Public Involvement

Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(iii): [The plan maintenance process **shall** include a] discussion on how the community will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.

	Location in the		SCO	ORE
Element	Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	N	S
A. Does the plan explain how continued public participation will be obtained? (For example, will there be public notices, an on-going mitigation plan committee, or annual review meetings with stakeholders?)	Page 6-1	This requirement is marginally met. The plan states that public comments, inputs and modifications are a necessary part of the plan. The plan also states that public input will be addressed in the annual updates, but does not specifically state how. Future submittals need to define how the public will be solicited to be involved on a continuing basis.		S
		SUMMARY SCORE		S

Matrix A: Profiling Hazards

This matrix can assist FEMA and the State in scoring each hazard. Local jurisdictions may find the matrix useful to ensure that their plan addresses each natural hazard that can affect the jurisdiction. **Completing the matrix is not required**.

Note: First, check which hazards are identified in requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i). Then, place a checkmark in either the N or S box for each **applicable** hazard. An "N" for any element of any identified hazard will result in a "Needs Improvement" score for this requirement. List the hazard and its related shortcoming in the comments section of the Plan Review Crosswalk.

Hazard Type	Hazards Identified Per Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i)	A. Lo	ocation	В. Е	Extent		evious rences	D. Probability of Future Events	
	Yes	N	S	N	S	N	S	N	S
Avalanche									
Coastal Erosion									
Coastal Storm									
Dam Failure									
Drought									
Earthquake									
Expansive Soils									
Extreme Heat					\Box				П
Flood									
Hailstorm									Ħ
Hurricane									
Land Subsidence							\Box		\Box
Landslide									
Severe Winter Storm									Ħ
Tornado									
Tsunami					\Box				
Volcano									
Wildfire		Ħ			一百二		一百	Ħ	Π
Windstorm									
Other		Ħ	Ħ		T I	Ħ	Ħ	Ħ	Ħ
Other									
Other									



Legend:

§201.6(c)(2)(i) Profiling Hazards

- A. Does the risk assessment identify the location (i.e., geographic area affected) of each hazard addressed in the plan?
- B. Does the risk assessment identify the extent (i.e., magnitude or severity) of each hazard addressed in the plan?
- C. Does the plan provide information on previous occurrences of each natural hazard addressed in the plan?
- D. Does the plan include the probability of future events (i.e., chance of occurrence) for each hazard addressed in the plan?

To check boxes, double

click on the box and change the default value to "checked."

Matrix B: Assessing Vulnerability

This matrix can assist FEMA and the State in scoring each hazard. Local jurisdictions may find the matrix useful to ensure that their plan addresses each requirement. Completing the matrix is not required.

Note: First, check which hazards are identified in requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i). Then, place a checkmark in either the N or S box for each applicable hazard. An "N" for any element of any identified hazard will result in a "Needs Improvement" score for this requirement. List the hazard and its related shortcoming in the comments section of the Plan Review Crosswalk.

Note: Receiving an N in the shaded columns will not preclude the plan from passing.

Hazard Type	Hazards Identified Per Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i)		A. Overall Summary B. Hazard Description of Impact Vulnerability		Structures	A. Types and Number of Existing Structures in Hazard Area (Estimate)		B. Types and Number of Future Structures in Hazard Area (Estimate)		Losses	A. Loss Estimate		B. Methodology			
	Yes	_	<u>N</u>	<u> </u>	N	<u></u>	ıctı	N	<u>s</u>	N	<u> </u>	ial	N	S	N	S
Avalanche	닏	Overview	_ Ц				Str.		Щ	Щ		Potential				
Coastal Erosion		erv	\Box									ote		\sqcup		
Coastal Storm		ò					Identifying					g F				
Dam Failure							ntif					tin				
Drought		ij					lde					<u>ii</u>				
Earthquake		Vulnerability:										Estimating				
Expansive Soils		-lue					ii									
Extreme Heat							rab					iit)				
Flood		Assessing					Vulnerability:					rab				
Hailstorm		SS					Λu					ne				
Hurricane		SSE					ng					n/				
Land Subsidence							Assessing					Assessing Vulnerability:				
Landslide		2)(ii					sse					ssi				
Severe Winter Storm		§201.6(c)(2)(ii)										sse				
Tornado		9.1					(ii)									
Tsunami		20					c)(2					ii)				
Volcano		S					§201.6(c)(2)(ii)					§201.6(c)(2)(ii)				
Wildfire							201					9)9:				
Windstorm							Ś		П			201				
Other			\Box								\Box	Š	\Box			
Other																
Other																

§201.6(c)(2)(ii) Assessing Vulnerability: Overview

- A. Does the plan include an overall summary description of the jurisdiction's vulnerability to each hazard?
- B. Does the plan address the impact of each hazard on the jurisdiction?

§201.6(c)(2)(ii)(A) Assessing Vulnerability: Identifying Structures

- A. Does the plan describe vulnerability in terms of the types and numbers of existing buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard areas?
- B. Does the plan describe vulnerability in terms of the types and numbers of future buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard areas?

§201.6(c)(2)(ii)(B) Assessing Vulnerability: Estimating Potential Losses

- A. Does the plan estimate potential dollar losses to vulnerable structures?
- B. Does the plan describe the methodology used to prepare the estimate?

Matrix C: Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Actions

This matrix can assist FEMA and the State in scoring each hazard. Local jurisdictions may find the matrix useful to ensure consideration of a range of actions for each hazard. **Completing the matrix is not required.**

Note: First, check which hazards are identified in requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i). Then, place a checkmark in either the N or S box for each **applicable** hazard. An "N" for any identified hazard will result in a "Needs Improvement" score for this requirement. List the hazard and its related shortcoming in the comments section of the Plan Review Crosswalk.

Hazard Type	Hazards Identified Per Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i)	A. Comprehensive Range of Actions and Projects				
	Yes	N S				
Avalanche						
Coastal Erosion						
Coastal Storm						
Dam Failure						
Drought						
Earthquake						
Expansive Soils						
Extreme Heat						
Flood						
Hailstorm						
Hurricane						
Land Subsidence						
Landslide						
Severe Winter Storm						
Tornado						
Tsunami						
Volcano						
Wildfire						
Windstorm						
Other						
Other						
Other						



Legend:

§201.6(c)(3)(ii) Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Actions

A. Does the plan identify and analyze a comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions and projects for each hazard?